REMARKS

Each of the examiners actions have been studied and it is believed that each has been satisfied by the amendments and traverse presented herein.

Regarding the 35 USC § 112 rejections, the changes indicated by the examiner have been made.

Addressing now the 35 USC § 102 rejections, the following is offered. The Guice reference, US patent 4,678,209 is not a suitable 102 bar for the reasons listed below.

- 1. The Guice reference does not have a separate die and slip. The slip is the die. Therefore, the die cannot embed projections into the slip.
- 2. Nowhere is it found that Guice anticipated the use of the textured surface as means to secure a die against vertical movement relative to a related slip.
 - 3. There is no slip and die interface.

2 40 6

4. A fundamental difference exists between the apparatus of Guice and the present invention. The Guice apparatus is directed to producing surface conditions that reduce the downward movement of a wedging element (combined slip and die) to reduce the consequent radial loads that crush suspended pipe. No die and slip interface is available or involved. If the interface were available, it would not serve the Guice objective. In the present invention a point of novelty enhances the ability of the die to transmit vertical pipe loads to the related slip. The slip is capable of transmitting crushing loads to pipe. No effort is made to prevent the wedging element (slip) from crushing pipe. The two inventions do different things by different processes to achieve different ends. An equivalency condition is not met.

The independent claims 1, 5, and 12 have been amended to further differentiate from the Guice reference.

Addressing now the 35 USC § 103 rejections related to the cited Guice and Bee, US patent s/n 5,971,086. The cited references eliminate an interface (slip and die) the present invention requires. Neither Guice nor Bee suggest variances or combinations that anticipate the present invention.

Upon a closer examination of the Guice reference, the independent claims, as now constituted, should stand. If they do so, all claims not canceled should stand.

The applicants have, for years, dealt with the high cost of materials used in petroleum production, often caused by the damaging of highly loaded machine elements on adjacent material. They have provided an economical approach to curing a vexing and costly problem. The invented concept does work. They need some protection to aid in marketing the innovation. Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

John D. Jeter

agent of record. My agents license number is 27,486